



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/604,316	06/27/2000	Gary R. Tidwell	BS99-124	5129

28970 7590 02/13/2004

SHAW PITTMAN
IP GROUP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 1300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

STIMPAK, JOHNNA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/604,316

Applicant(s) **SW**

TIDWELL ET AL.

Examiner

Johnna R Stimpak

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9-19,21-25,28-33,36-50 and 53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9-19,21-25,28-33,36-50 and 53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3623

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 5, 2004 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. In response to applicant's amendment to include the approval of the trouble ticket resolution, Examiner construes this to mean it is determined if the contracted party will resolve the trouble ticket or if it would be better addressed by another. In light of this, a new reference, Bedeski et al, has been added. The background of the Bedeski et al reference teaches two well-known resolutions for a trouble ticket. One being the determination of who would be best suited to resolve the trouble ticket. Bedeski et al teaches the trouble ticket being generated and communicated to a technician, and a determination is made to whether that technician should work on the trouble ticket or if it should be referred to another department for resolution. If the trouble ticket is referred to another party it is "disapproved", but if the initial party address the problem, the resolution is "approved". The rejections have been reformulated to include the Bedeski et al reference.

Art Unit: 3623

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-25, 29-33, 36, 38, 39, 42-45, 46-50** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Jones et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,219,648 B1, in view of Peregrine's MELBA, as disclosed in the article entitled "Peregrine Systems Forms Alliance with Mitsubishi Electronics America; Integrated Enterprise Applications to be Developed", and Bedeski et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,516,055.

As per **claim 1**, Jones et al teaches a server in communication with an electronic network (column 7, lines 40-44, 49-51, 62-67 – a paging server is used to facilitate notification of trouble ticket alerts); a database in communication with the server, the database storing a plurality of trouble tickets (column 5, lines 55-60, column 6, lines 49-56) – information pertaining to trouble tickets is stored); a user computer in communication with the network and having access, via a graphical user interface (GUI), to the server, the graphical user interface including at least one screen, the screen being operable to enter a new trouble ticket along with (i) a person responsible for resolving the ticket (column 6, lines 5-12, lines 40-49, column 5, lines 55-60 – service center personnel enter trouble ticket information such as ID of the technician involved in resolution) and (ii) a severity level for the trouble ticket, and to store the trouble ticket in the database (column 5, lines 55-67 – escalation levels are entered for the trouble ticket which alert

Art Unit: 3623

appropriate personnel to respond); and a paging system, in communication with the server, wherein when the severity level associated with the trouble ticket is above a predetermined threshold, the server automatically initiates a call to the person responsible via the paging system (column 7, lines 55-67 – when alerting criteria is satisfied, the managing module sends an alert through a paging server to a specified person).

Jones et al teaches all the limitation of claim 1 but does not explicitly teach means for sharing the trouble ticket data with an organization that operates under outside contract, the organization assigning its own tracking number to a given trouble ticket or the tracking number being stored in the database of the trouble tracking system. Peregrine's MELBA system allows customers to share trouble ticket information with outsourced contractors wherein opening a trouble ticket on the internal service would automatically open a corresponding ticket on an outsourcing contractor's help desk (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). The system is also updated as new information becomes available during work on open tickets (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). The system is also monitors and reports on the status of the ticket until resolution (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). Both Jones et al and Peregrine's MELBA teach trouble ticket systems wherein the tickets are created and the appropriate service providers are alerted to resolve the issue. The systems in both references perform the same functions, but Peregrine's MELBA goes one step further in that the trouble ticket can be acted upon by outside contractors in addition to other service providers. In Peregrine's MELBA opening a trouble ticket on an internal service desk automatically opens a ticket on an outside contractors help desk, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include Peregrine's outsourced contractors as recipients of the trouble tickets created in Jones et al because the

Art Unit: 3623

capabilities of the system would allow for faster, more accurate interaction, collaboration, problem diagnosis and resolution of support/problems.

The combination of Jones et al and Peregrine's MELBA teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as addressed above, but does not explicitly teach storing information relating to whether a resolution of a trouble ticket, proposed by outsourced personnel who work for the organization, has been approved by internal personnel for whom the outsourced personnel are working. The Bedeski et al patent teaches two well-known resolutions for a trouble ticket. One being the determination of who would be best suited to resolve the trouble ticket. Bedeski et al teaches the trouble ticket being generated and communicated to a technician, and a determination is made to whether that technician should work on the trouble ticket or if it should be referred to another department for resolution. If the trouble ticket is referred to another party it is "disapproved", but if the initial party address the problem, the resolution is "approved".

Jones et al, Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teach trouble ticket systems wherein the tickets are created and the appropriate service providers are alerted to resolve the issue. The systems in the references perform the same functions, but Bedeski et al goes one step further in that the trouble ticket can be approved and it is decided who should resolve the ticket issue. Since all three references teach trouble ticket resolution systems, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Bedeski et al's approval with the combination of Jones et al and MELBA to produce a trouble ticket system wherein resolution could occur more efficiently.

As per **claim 2**, Jones et al teaches an email server, wherein the email server automatically sends an email message to the person responsible for resolving the ticket and the

Art Unit: 3623

email message includes at least a trouble ticket number (column 3, lines 45-47, column 5, lines 51-60 – an email message is sent upon alert, including trouble ticket number).

As per **claim 3**, Jones et al teaches a report creation module, the report creation module being operable to generate reports based on the plurality of trouble tickets stored in the database (column 8, lines 55-67).

As per **claim 4**, Jones et al teaches a duplicate search module, the duplicate search module identifying at least one of an actual or a potential duplicate trouble ticket stored in the database (column 10, lines 11-18 – the parsing module searches ticket numbers to see if there are duplicate numbers, if so, the second ticket is ignored).

As per **claim 5**, Jones et al teaches the duplicate search module lists at least one pair of the actual or potential duplicate trouble tickets (column 10, lines 4-18 – the parsing manager sorts the master ticket numbers which are associated with each trouble ticket, when a first and second trouble ticket have the same master ticket number, the second can be ignored).

As per **claim 6**, Jones et al in view of Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teach the trouble tickets comprise at least one of a problem (column 5, lines 55-60) and an inquiry (column 5, lines 55-60), but does not teach adding a bill notification and a user acceptance data issue to the database. Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that when a service is performed a charges will incur. It would have been obvious to add billing information to the database for proper record keeping. It would also be obvious to include user acceptance data. It is also old and well known that when a service is performed there may be other non-related or related services that could be performed that are not known at the time the trouble ticket is processed. It would be obvious to make note of this and get the acceptance from the user. If the

Art Unit: 3623

user agrees, the service can be performed and an appropriate charge will be made. The motivation for adding the billing information and user acceptance information would be to keep an accurate record of charges to be made for services provided. This will also cut down on services being provided that are not wanted by the user.

As per **claim 9**, Jones et al teaches the database further stores status information (column 9, lines 1-22).

As per **claim 11**, Jones et al teaches the network comprises the Internet (column 6, lines 28-32).

As per **claim 12**, Jones et al teaches a plurality of computers interconnected in a network, one of the computers including a trouble ticket database and an executable program for accessing and updating the database and each of the computers having access to a graphical user interface (GUI), the GUI including at least one screen operable to add a new trouble ticket to the database (column 6, lines 5-34), each trouble ticket including at least (i) a description of the issue (inherently a trouble ticket will include some description of the issue or problem), (ii) a person responsible for resolving the issue (column 8 lines 65-67 the report indicates the appropriate service center to handle the ticket, column 9, the position field indicates the technician assigned to the trouble ticket) and (iii) a severity level of the issue (column 9 the time field indicates the time when the ticket was generated, column 7, lines 55-58, time duration is used for alerting appropriate personnel to respond); an email system in communication with the executable program, the executable program automatically emailing a trouble ticket number to the person responsible for resolving the issue (column 7, lines 62-67, column 8, lines 1-4 – the error manager alerts the appropriate personnel by email); and a paging system automatically paging

Art Unit: 3623

the person responsible for resolving the issue when the severity level of the trouble ticket is above a predetermined threshold (column 7, lines 62-67, column 8, lines 1-4 – the error manager alerts the appropriate personnel by paging).

Jones et al teaches all the limitation of claim 1 but does not explicitly teach means for sharing the trouble ticket data with an organization that operates under outside contract, the organization assigning its own tracking number to a given trouble ticket, or the tracking number being stored in the database of the trouble tracking system. Peregrine's MELBA system allows customers to share trouble ticket information with outsourced contractors wherein opening a trouble ticket on the internal service would automatically open a corresponding ticket on an outsourcing contractor's help desk (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). The system is also updated as new information becomes available during work on open tickets (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). The system is also monitors and reports on the status of the ticket until resolution (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). Both Jones et al and Peregrine's MELBA teach trouble ticket systems wherein the tickets are created and the appropriate service providers are alerted to resolve the issue. The systems in both references perform the same functions, but Peregrine's MELBA goes one step further in that the trouble ticket can be acted upon by outside contractors in addition to other service providers. In Peregrine's MELBA opening a trouble ticket on an internal service desk automatically opens a ticket on an outside contractors help desk, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include Peregrine's outsourced contractors as recipients of the trouble tickets created in Jones et al because the capabilities of the system would allow for faster, more accurate interaction, collaboration, problem diagnosis and resolution of support/problems.

Art Unit: 3623

The combination of Jones et al and Peregrine's MELBA teaches all the limitations of claims 1 as addressed above, but does not explicitly teach storing information relating to whether a resolution of a trouble ticket, proposed by outsourced personnel who work for the organization, has been approved by internal personnel for whom the outsourced personnel are working. The Bedeski et al patent teaches two well-known resolutions for a trouble ticket. One being the determination of who would be best suited to resolve the trouble ticket. Bedeski et al teaches the trouble ticket being generated and communicated to a technician, and a determination is made to whether that technician should work on the trouble ticket or if it should be referred to another department for resolution. If the trouble ticket is referred to another party it is "disapproved", but if the initial party address the problem, the resolution is "approved".

Jones et al, Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teach trouble ticket systems wherein the tickets are created and the appropriate service providers are alerted to resolve the issue. The systems in the references perform the same functions, but Bedeski et al goes one step further in that the trouble ticket can be approved and it is decided who should resolve the ticket issue. Since all three references teach trouble ticket resolution systems, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Bedeski et al's approval with the combination of Jones et al and MELBA to produce a trouble ticket system wherein resolution could occur more efficiently.

As per **claim 13**, Jones et al teaches the paging system transmits the trouble ticket number (column 2, lines 25-31).

As per **claim 16**, Jones et al in view of Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teach the trouble tickets comprise at least one of a problem (column 5, lines 55-60) and an inquiry (column

Art Unit: 3623

5, lines 55-60), but does not teach adding a bill notification and a user acceptance data issue to the database. Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that when a service is performed a charges will incur. It would have been obvious to add billing information to the database for proper record keeping. It would also be obvious to include user acceptance data. It is also old and well known that when a service is performed there may be other non-related or related services that could be performed that are not known at the time the trouble ticket is processed. It would be obvious to make note of this and get the acceptance from the user. If the user agrees, the service can be performed and an appropriate charge will be made. The motivation for adding the billing information and user acceptance information would be to keep an accurate record of charges to be made for services provided. This will also cut down on services being provided that are not wanted by the user.

As per **claim 17**, Jones et al teaches a duplicate trouble ticket module (column 10, lines 11-18 – the parsing module searches ticket numbers to see if there are duplicate numbers, if so, the second ticket is ignored).

As per **claim 18**, Jones et al teaches a report creation module (column 8, lines 55-67).

As per **claim 19**, Jones et al teaches the database is accessible via the Internet (column 6, lines 28-32).

As per **claim 21**, Jones et al teaches a central computer including an executable program and a database wherein the database stores a plurality of trouble tickets (column 6, lines 5-34 and 49-52), each trouble ticket including a trouble ticket number, an issue description and a duplicate ticket flag (column 9, lines 36-40 (service code defines service to be provided), 48-50 (trouble ticket number) and lines 63-66 (function level code refers to tickets grouped together based on

Art Unit: 3623

duplicate master ticket number) column 10, lines 4-10); a plurality of user computers connected to the central computer via a network, the user computers displaying a graphical user interface (GUI) that permits entry and updating of trouble tickets in the database (column 6, lines 15-27 and 35-45 – the system runs on a computer wherein the service providers enter trouble ticket information); and a duplicate ticket module operable to search the database for actual or potential duplicate trouble tickets, the duplicate ticket module making available a list of actual or potential duplicate trouble tickets, wherein one or more duplicate trouble tickets are flagged with a trouble ticket number of a representative trouble ticket (column 10, lines 4-24 – the ticket numbers are grouped according to master ticket number, a parsing module combines trouble tickets having the same master ticket number by checking the trouble ticket numbers).

Jones et al teaches all the limitation of claim 1 but does not explicitly teach means for sharing the trouble ticket data with an organization that operates under outside contract, the organization assigning its own tracking number to a given trouble ticket, or the tracking number being stored in the database of the trouble tracking system. Peregrine's MELBA system allows customers to share trouble ticket information with outsourced contractors wherein opening a trouble ticket on the internal service would automatically open a corresponding ticket on an outsourcing contractor's help desk (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). The system is also updated as new information becomes available during work on open tickets (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). The system is also monitors and reports on the status of the ticket until resolution (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). Both Jones et al and Peregrine's MELBA teach trouble ticket systems wherein the tickets are created and the appropriate service providers are alerted to resolve the issue. The systems in both references perform the same functions, but Peregrine's MELBA goes

Art Unit: 3623

one step further in that the trouble ticket can be acted upon by outside contractors in addition to other service providers. In Peregrine's MELBA opening a trouble ticket on an internal service desk automatically opens a ticket on an outside contractors help desk, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include Peregrine's outsourced contractors as recipients of the trouble tickets created in Jones et al because the capabilities of the system would allow for faster, more accurate interaction, collaboration, problem diagnosis and resolution of support/problems.

The combination of Jones et al and Peregrine's MELBA teaches all the limitations of claims 1 as addressed above, but does not explicitly teach storing information relating to whether a resolution of a trouble ticket, proposed by outsourced personnel who work for the organization, has been approved by internal personnel for whom the outsourced personnel are working. The Bedeski et al patent teaches two well-known resolutions for a trouble ticket. One being the determination of who would be best suited to resolve the trouble ticket. Bedeski et al teaches the trouble ticket being generated and communicated to a technician, and a determination is made to whether that technician should work on the trouble ticket or if it should be referred to another department for resolution. If the trouble ticket is referred to another party it is "disapproved", but if the initial party address the problem, the resolution is "approved".

Jones et al, Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teach trouble ticket systems wherein the tickets are created and the appropriate service providers are alerted to resolve the issue. The systems in the references perform the same functions, but Bedeski et al goes one step further in that the trouble ticket can be approved and it is decided who should resolve the ticket issue. Since all three references teach trouble ticket resolution systems, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 3623

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Bedeski et al's approval with the combination of Jones et al and MELBA to produce a trouble ticket system wherein resolution could occur more efficiently.

As per **claim 22**, Jones et al teaches a paging system (column 7, lines 55-67 – when alerting criteria is satisfied, the managing module sends an alert through a paging server to a specified person).

As per **claim 23**, Jones et al teaches each trouble ticket further includes an indication of severity and a person responsible field and when the indication of severity exceeds a predetermined threshold, the person identified in the person responsible field is paged (column 7, lines 55-67 – when alerting criteria is satisfied, the managing module sends an alert through a paging server to a specified person also column 9, lines 13-14 (the time field) – in Jones et al when the time duration reaches the specified criteria and alert is sent, the time field is included on the trouble ticket).

As per **claim 24**, Jones et al teaches an email server, wherein the person identified in the person responsible field is sent an email alerting him that he has been assigned a trouble ticket (column 62-67 and column 8, lines 1-5 – the person responsible for responding to the alert is emailed).

As per **claim 25**, Jones et al in view of Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teach the trouble tickets comprise at least one of a problem (column 5, lines 55-60) and an inquiry (column 5, lines 55-60), but does not teach adding a bill notification and a user acceptance data issue to the database. Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that when a service is performed a charges will incur. It would have been obvious to add billing information to the

Art Unit: 3623

database for proper record keeping. It would also be obvious to include user acceptance data. It is also old and well known that when a service is performed there may be other non-related or related services that could be performed that are not known at the time the trouble ticket is processed. It would be obvious to make note of this and get the acceptance from the user. If the user agrees, the service can be performed and an appropriate charge will be made. The motivation for adding the billing information and user acceptance information would be to keep an accurate record of charges to be made for services provided. This will also cut down on services being provided that are not wanted by the user.

As per **claims 29-33 and 36**, they are the method for performing the steps of the system in claims 1-6 and 9, therefore the same rejection as applied to claims 1-6 and 9 apply to claims 29-33 and 36.

As per **claims 38, 39 and 42-45**, they are the method for performing the steps of the system in claims 12, 13 and 16-19, therefore the same rejection as applied to claims 12, 13 and 16-19 also applies to claims 38, 39 and 42-45.

As per **claims 46-50**, they are the method for performing the steps of the system in claims 21-25, therefore the same rejection as applied to claims 21-25 also applies to claims 46-50.

5. **Claims 10, 14, 15, 28, 37, 40, 41 and 53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al in view of Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al, in further view of Kidder et al, US Patent No. 6,445,774 B1.

As per **claim 10**, Jones et al in view of Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teaches all the limitation of claim 10 as applied to claim 1, but does not teach the database further stores

Art Unit: 3623

information associating a trouble ticket to a geographical region. Kidder et al teaches recording the site location data (column 11, line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the geographical information of Kidder et al in the trouble ticket of Jones et al for tracking purposes and for purposes of assigning responsible personnel. Doing this would give the responsible personnel more information to lead to the resolution of the problem. The personnel would be more informed as to the location of the problem and would know exactly where to go. This would cut down on wasting time trying to track down the problem.

As per **claim 14**, Jones et al in view of Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teaches new trouble ticket fields including status (Jones: column 9, lines 50-54) but does not teach the screen operable to add a new trouble ticket includes a field indicating the closed date of the trouble ticket. Kidder et al teaches storing a "terminate message" conveying that the ticket has been closed (column 13, lines 2-5). It is old and well known in the art that trouble tickets are "closed out" upon delivery of service as an indication that the problem does not need to be attended to. Jones et al teaches recording the open date of the trouble ticket so it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the recordation of the closed date of Kidder et al into the trouble ticket of Jones et al to provide for an indication that the particular matter does not need any further consideration. This is helpful for saving time from attending to problems that have already been resolved.

As per **claim 15**, Jones et al in view of Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teaches all the limitation of claim 15 as applied to claim 12, but does not teach the database further stores information associating a trouble ticket to a geographical region. Kidder et al teaches recording the site location data (column 11, line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 3623

the art to include the geographical information of Kidder et al in the trouble ticket of Jones et al for tracking purposes and for purposes of assigning responsible personnel. Doing this would give the responsible personnel more information to lead to the resolution of the problem. The personnel would be more informed as to the location of the problem and would know exactly where to go. This would cut down on wasting time trying to track down the problem.

As per **claim 28**, Jones et al in view of Peregrine's MELBA and Bedeski et al teaches all the limitation of claim 28 as applied to claim 21, but does not teach the database further stores information associating a trouble ticket to a geographical region. Kidder et al teaches recording the site location data (column 11, line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the geographical information of Kidder et al in the trouble ticket of Jones et al for tracking purposes and for purposes of assigning responsible personnel. Doing this would give the responsible personnel more information to lead to the resolution of the problem. The personnel would be more informed as to the location of the problem and would know exactly where to go. This would cut down on wasting time trying to track down the problem.

As per **claim 37**, it is the method of the steps of the system of claim 10; therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 10 also applies to claim 37.

As per **claim 40**, it is the method of the steps of the system of claim 14; therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 14 also applies to claim 40.

As per **claim 41**, it is the method of the steps of the system of claim 15; therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 15 also applies to claim 41.

As per **claim 53**, it is the method of the steps of the system of claim 28; therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 28 also applies to claim 53.

Art Unit: 3623

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnna R Stimpak whose telephone number is 703-305-4566.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Js
February 3, 2004


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800